DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 831 FL 800 644

AUTHOR Nurss, Joanne R.
TITLE Clayton Family Literacy and School Support Services Project: Project Class. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Georgia State Univ., Atlanta. Center for the Study of Adult Literacy.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 79p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Literacy; *Asian Americans; Cambodians; Community Services; Cooperative Programs; Curriculum Development; Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Family Programs; *Hispanic Americans; *Immigrants; Language Tests; Laotians; *Limited English Speaking; *Literacy Education; Pretests Posttests; Questionnaires; Student Recruitment; Vietnamese
IDENTIFIERS Clayton County Schools GA; Georgia (Clayton County); Support Services

ABSTRACT

Project CLASS, a collaborative family literacy demonstration research project designed to meet the language and literacy needs of limited English proficient families in Clayton County, Georgia, is described. Intergenerational and age-graded classes were provided for Cambodian, Laotian, Vietnamese, and Hispanic adult family members, their out-of-school youth, and their school-age or preschool children. The Project CLASS curriculum, based on the work of D. Scott Enright, was a multi-level, integrated language and literacy curriculum delivered through content-based themes and supplemented by contextually-based activities. Fifty-six families representing 92 adults and 14[illegible] children participated; unfortunately, attendance was not consistent, ranging from 2 to 71 percent of classes attended. Reasons for absences and dropouts included job changes, moving, and family problems; additional factors included conflict with a local church program, the closing of a major employer, and violence in the Cambodian community. It is recommended that future family English literacy programs give more attention to ways to motivate families to attend and to remain in the program long enough to demonstrate gains in language and literacy. The integrated, thematic approach; the multi-level, intergenerational activities; and the field trips and holiday celebrations were found to be important components of the family program. The assessment instruments and a list of project dissemination efforts are appended. (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education) (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359831

CLAYTON FAMILY LITERACY AND SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICES PROJECT: PROJECT CLASS

FINAL REPORT

Joanne R. Nurss

Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University, Atlanta

September 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joanne Nurss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, Title VII

FL 200644

CLAYTON FAMILY LITERACY AND
SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICES
PROJECT: PROJECT CLASS

FINAL REPORT

Center for the Study of Adult Literacy

Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

FL800644

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLAYTON FAMILY LITERACY AND SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICES PROJECT: PROJECT CLASS

FINAL REPORT

Joanne R. Nurss

Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University, Atlanta

September 1992

This project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education
Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, Title VII

FL800644

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Stacey Jones, Susan Rawlston, and Rhonda Webb for their help in preparing this report; to all the staff of Project CLASS (teachers, community liaisons, coordinators, research assistants, consultants, bus drivers), the school system, and GMAAC; and to the families, who made this research program possible.

Project curriculum available at cost:

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (1992). Clayton family literacy and school support services project: Project CLASS. Family English literacy curriculum. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

This volume includes a description of the Project CLASS family English literacy curriculum, the process by which it was developed, and the themes and sample lesson plans for the three years.

Write to: The Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083

Table of Contents

Page

Executive Summary 2

Introduction 5

Overview of Project CLASS 6

Goals & Objectives 7

Curriculum Development 8

Curriculum Implementation 10

Subjects 13

Recruitment 13
Retention 14

Table 1. Enrollment by Group and by Year 15
Table 2. Attendance Data 17

Demographic Data 18

Table 3. Demographic Data: Adults and Children 19

Assessment Instruments 21

Results 22

Table 4. Pre-/Post-test Scores & t-tests: Adults 23
Table 5. Pre-/Post-test Scores & t-tests: Adults Who Attended Project CLASS Three Years 24
Table 6. Pre-/Post-test Scores & t-tests: Children 26
Table 7. Interview Data 27

Discussion 31

Strengths of the Program 32
Problems Encountered 33

Conclusions 33

Recommendations for Family English Literacy Programs 34

References 35

Appendices 37

A. Assessment Instruments 37
B. Dissemination Efforts 65

Executive Summary

Family English literacy programs are designed to break the intergenerational cycle of illiteracy by improving parents' literacy skills, thus making it more likely that they will provide the literacy experiences and background their children need to learn to read and write and to succeed in school. To be effective, family English literacy programs need to be socio-culturally relevant to the participants and sensitive to their bilingual/bicultural background.

Project CLASS was designed to meet the language and literacy needs of limited English proficient Cambodian, Laotian, Vietnamese, and Hispanic families. A collaborative effort of the Clayton County Board of Education, the Center for the Study of Adult Literacy at Georgia State University, and the Georgia Mutual Assistance Association Consortium, it was funded by a three-year Family English Literacy grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, Title VII. Project CLASS provided both intergenerational and age-graded classes for adult family members, their out-of school youth, and their school-age and preschool children. Classes were held twice per week for two hours per evening from January 1990 through May 1992. Bus transportation was provided to the local elementary school site. Bilingual community liaisons assisted with recruitment and provided language and cultural support to the families. The objectives of the program were to provide language and literacy instruction and to provide cultural knowledge, school support skills, and information about community resources to the families.

The curriculum for Project CLASS was based upon the work of D. Scott Enright. It was designed as a multi-level, integrated language and literacy curriculum, delivered through content-based themes. Activities were cooperative, concrete, flexible, authentic, and contextually-based. Themes and activities were planned in quarterly inservice and weekly planning meetings attended by all five teachers and the instructional coordinator. Once a theme was selected, they

planned both intergenerational and age-graded activities appropriate to the heterogeneous language and literacy skills of the students. The themes developed and sample lesson plans for the three years are presented in Project CLASS Family English Literacy Curriculum (Nurss & Rawlston, 1992). A community resource guide, Project CLASS Community Resource Directory for Clayton County, Georgia (Nurss, Rawlston, Cargile, & Jones, 1992), was also published.

Fifty-six families representing 92 adults and 145 children participated in the program. Unfortunately, attendance was not consistent among the families enrolled, ranging from 2% to 71% of classes attended. Reasons given for low attendance and for dropping out of the program included job changes, moving, and family problems. Conflict with a local church program caused a drop in attendance one evening per week for part of the project. A large number of Laotian families moved from the area when their major employer closed. Violence in the Cambodian community caused a temporary drop in their enrollment. Bilingual community liaisons contacted families whenever they were absent from the program, attempting to keep attendance high.

Results were assessed using the Basic English Skills Test (BEST), a Cloze reading test, and a process writing task for adults; the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) for children; and interviews with a sample of participants (adults, children, teachers, liaisons, and administrators). Pre- and post-test scores on some measures increased, but the only significant gains were in LAB scores for children in Year 2 and in Best Oral Test scores for adult participants who were enrolled in Project CLASS for all three years. The lack of significant test score gains may be due, in part, to the sporadic attendance of those participants who were tested and the failure to obtain post-test scores on all of the adults. Interview data, however, indicated satisfaction with the program and a general feeling that the participants gained in English language and literacy proficiency.

Strengths of the program included the content-based, intergenerational/family, integrated language and literacy program; the bilingual community liaisons; the teachers and the instructional coordinator; the planning process; the cultural activities; and the preschool class. Problems encountered included sporadic attendance; the high drop-out rate; inadequate assessment measures; and the difficulty of adult ESL teachers to adjust to the integrated, intergenerational curriculum model. It is recommended that future family English literacy programs give even more attention to ways to motivate families to attend consistently and to remain in the program long enough to demonstrate gains in language and literacy. In addition to transportation, child care, and bilingual liaisons, incentives may need to be provided. The integrated, thematic approach; the multi-level, intergenerational activities; and the field trips and holiday celebrations included in Project CLASS are important components of a successful family English literacy program.

Introduction

Family English literacy programs are designed to break the intergenerational cycle of illiteracy by improving parents' literacy skills, thus making it more likely that they will provide the literacy experiences and background their children need to learn to read and write and to succeed in school. These programs vary from literacy classes for parents with child care included to intergenerational literacy classes for the entire family (Nickse, 1990; Nash, 1987; McIvor, 1990). Most English-as-a-second language (ESL) family literacy programs provide some type of English language and literacy instruction for family members as well as an introduction to American culture (Nash, 1987). Project FIEL (Quintero & Huerta-Macias, 1988) was an opportunity for Spanish-speaking parents to attend class with their preschool and first grade children. The curriculum emphasized home activities to help them acquire English language proficiency, and to prepare their children culturally and linguistically for success in school. In contrast, Project LEIF (Weinstein-Shr, 1988) offered intergenerational literacy tutoring of Chinese, Hmong, and Hispanic adults, many of whom were elderly. While the approach was intergenerational, the persons working together were not from the same family. One of the goals of the project was to develop relationships across generations and across cultures. Home English Literacy for Parents (Terdy & Bercovitz, 1989) provides a basic literacy curriculum for limited English proficient (LEP) parents, including a unit on school-related "survival" language competencies which parents can do at home with their school-age children. Still other approaches to family literacy are parent involvement (e.g., getting parents involved in the PTA or other school activities) or parent tutoring, working with parents on a one-to-one basis (Simich-Dudgeon, 1986; Nash, 1987).

To be effective a family literacy program must be socio-culturally relevant to the participants (Auerbach, 1989). This can be accomplished by developing the curriculum from the

perspective of the families to meet their needs, rather than from the perspective of the instructors or to meet the students' assumed needs. A socio-culturally relevant program for non-native English speaking families would include their native culture and language in the activities as well as introducing them to their new culture and increasing their proficiency in their new language. Respect for all cultures, bilingual activities, and including the participants in planning and evaluation are essential. Research is needed on the effectiveness of an intergenerational family English literacy program, involving parents and their children in culturally-relevant activities to acquire the language, literacy, and cultural knowledge and skills needed to ensure the children's educational success in the American school system. Project CLASS was developed to meet this need.

Overview of Project CLASS

Project CLASS was a Family English Literacy demonstration research project, designed to meet the language and literacy needs of limited English proficient families in Clayton County, Georgia. The project provided an integrated program for adult family members and their school-age and preschool children and their out-of-school youth. It was a collaborative effort of the Clayton County Board of Education, the Center for the Study of Adult Literacy at Georgia State University, and the Georgia Mutual Assistance Association Consortium, funded by a three-year Family English Literacy grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Title VII. The Clayton County School System has a growing limited English proficient (LEP) population, served only by a state- and locally-funded resource program for children and a refugee program for adults. When the project began in 1989, the primary LEP population in the Clayton County Schools was distributed among four groups: Laotian (26%), Cambodian/Khmer (16%), Vietnamese (9%), and Hispanic (49%). The school system does not have a Title VII program for its Kindergarten through Grade 12 ESOL

students. Therefore, this Family English Literacy Project was a much-needed, new venture that provided English-as-a-second language services to families not otherwise served. Classes were held twice per week for two hours per evening for eight 10-week terms and two six-week summer terms from January 1990 through May 1992. Bus transportation was provided to the site, a local elementary school convenient to the neighborhoods in which the families lived. Both intergenerational family instruction and age-graded classes (preschool, elementary, middle/secondary, and adult) were provided. Classes were heterogeneous in language proficiency and in native language and provided cooperative, experienced-based, integrated language and literacy instruction. Instruction was planned around themes to provide cultural knowledge, school support, and information about community resources to the families. Bilingual community liaisons from each of the target languages were employed to assist with recruitment, retention, and enrollment; and to provide language and cultural support to the families.

Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of this project was to increase the families' English language and literacy proficiency and their knowledge and skills needed to adjust successfully to their new society and culture, and to support the educational success of their children. The specific goals were:

- To provide an integrated program of English language and literacy instruction.
- To provide Limited English Proficient (LEP) parents and out-of-school family members with the knowledge and skills needed to successfully adjust to their new society and culture.
- To provide LEP parents and out-of-school family members with the knowledge and skills needed to fully support the educational success of their preschool and school-age children.
- To develop, field-test, implement, and publish an intergenerational bilingual/ESL family literacy curriculum which integrates oral and written English instruction, cultural awareness instruction, and parenting and school support instruction.

- To develop a cooperative network of community, health, educational, and social service agencies for LEP families and to familiarize LEP families with that network and how to use its resources effectively.

Curriculum Development

The curriculum for Project CLASS was inspired by the work of one of the project's consultants, D. Scott Enright (Enright & McCloskey, 1988). It was designed as a multi-level, integrated language and literacy curriculum in which instruction was delivered through content-based themes. Activities were cooperative, concrete, flexible, authentic, and contextually-based. Initially, the curriculum was developed by an experienced adult ESOL educator in conjunction with the Instructional Site Coordinator and the teachers. Beginning with the first summer term, the curriculum was cooperatively developed by the Instructional Site Coordinator and the teachers. The consultant directed a one-day inservice session in which the themes were selected and initial planning was completed. Weekly teacher planning sessions were held during the term to complete the curriculum development. This pattern continued for the remainder of the project period. Teachers were paid for the quarterly inservice sessions and for two hours of planning per week.

Periodic meetings were held with the adults and the Bilingual Community Liaisons to obtain suggestions and evaluation of the activities from the perspective of the participants. Initially, the adults and the liaisons wanted a structured, teacher-directed, paper-and-pencil curriculum stressing grammar and vocabulary lists. As the project developed, most began to understand that both they and their children were learning through the interactive activities. Teachers learned to help the adults record key vocabulary and phrases and cultural information in their notebooks, an activity the adults felt essential to being a student. Near the end of the program one mother commented that she finally understood that she and her children could, and had, learned English through playing games!

In the middle of Year 2, the outside consultant, Gail Weinstein-Shr, visited the project, met with teachers, observed classes, and consulted with the Instructional Site Coordinator, Project Director, and local curriculum consultant. She also gave a workshop on family literacy for the Project CLASS staff and ESOL personnel in the metropolitan Atlanta area. Her input throughout the project helped to make the curriculum more learner-centered and culturally-sensitive. She was particularly helpful in guiding the teachers to use each family's own story as a vehicle for language, literacy, and cultural sharing and learning.

Once a theme had been selected, the team planned both intergenerational and age-graded activities appropriate to the language and literacy skills of the students. The planning process was one of negotiation as teachers experienced in working with various aged individuals learned how to plan and implement activities for a multi-age, multi-level group. The themes developed and sample lesson plans for the three years are presented in the Project CLASS Family English Literacy Curriculum (Nurss & Rawlston, 1992).

Themes were selected to meet the objectives of providing the families with the knowledge and skills necessary to adjust to a new culture and to support their children's educational success. Clayton County's community resources available to the families were highlighted. A directory of these community resources was developed and published as a part of Project CLASS (Nurss, Rawlston, Cargile, & Jones, 1992). Field trips to many of these resources were planned. For example, a unit on health care resources included a visit to a local dental clinic, and visits to the local public library where families completed applications for library cards were annual activities. In other instances, community representatives visited Project CLASS; e.g., a police officer came to demonstrate the use of 911 for emergencies and a safety expert demonstrated the use of seat belts and car seats for children.

Most class meetings included some time in an age-graded class and some time in an intergenerational activity, both providing language, literacy, and cultural instruction integrated into the current theme. In a theme on story-telling, for example, adults and children worked in family groups to record their family's story of their native country and their earlier life there. Adults told the stories to the children, often in their native language. School-age children helped the adults record these stories in English to read to their family and to share with other families in Project CLASS. Liaisons assisted families in writing their stories in their native language (many adults were not literate in their native language). In their age-graded classes, students worked on vocabulary in their stories; edited their writing for grammatical structures, spelling, and written language conventions; and read books about their native land to later share with other family members. Middle/secondary students assisted adults in using the school computers to type their family stories to be "published" into a book. Beginning literacy level adults practiced reading picture story books to read to one or two students from the preschool class. Family groups illustrated and bound their stories into books to take home. Each of these activities developed the adults' and children's English language oral and written proficiency, and helped the children learn more about their native culture and language. By comparing their family stories with those of other families and to life in the United States, the families also increased their knowledge about their new culture.

Curriculum Implementation

Project CLASS was a research and demonstration program designed to develop and implement a family English literacy curriculum. It was hoped that the Clayton County Board of Education would assume responsibility for continuing the program when the external funding was completed. In fact, the Adult Education Coordinator (with responsibility for adult refugee ESL classes) and the Kindergarten - Grade 12 ESOL Coordinator have worked cooperatively to

try to do so. Over the three years, the school system assumed more financial and administrative responsibility for the program each year.

Project CLASS was staffed by the Instructional Site Coordinator who administered and supervised all aspects of the program. Classes were taught by five experienced teachers, most employed by the Clayton County Board of Education during the day. They each were assigned an age-graded class (preschool, elementary, middle/secondary, beginning-level or intermediate-level adult). Each also was responsible for cooperatively planning and implementing the intergenerational activities.

The Bilingual Community Liaisons were available to assist with language and cultural support to the instructional program. Their presence immediately put new families at ease, and the liaisons could orient the families to the logistics of the program and the different groups. Most families had been recruited in person by the liaisons, so they looked for this familiar face upon arrival. Liaisons also assisted the families in completing the demographic information forms. They consulted with teachers about themes and activities and their population's reaction to these topics; e.g., they helped teachers plan activities for each culture's New Year's celebration. They also explained their families' reluctance to engage in certain activities, for example, a "revolt" against cooking. The teachers had planned a series of activities in which foods from the U.S. and each of the four target cultures would be prepared and sampled at Project CLASS. The cooking activity would have provided many opportunities for oral and written language (recipes, shopping, descriptions of the foods). Making brownies was successful, but the Southeast Asian women refused to cook. They said they had just come home from work and fixed supper for they families and didn't want to come to class to do *more* cooking! Besides, they pointed out that none of the men in their families would help with the cooking! So a pedagogically sound activity was dropped because it was not culturally sound. Bilingual community liaisons also

helped with oral translation for new families, rewrote stories in their native languages, and assisted with field trips, guest speakers, and other special projects. They also helped with child care for new preschool children who did not understand English. In addition, they occasionally rode the bus to make certain pick-up and delivery was going smoothly.

The elementary school allowed Project CLASS to use five classrooms plus the media center, computer room, cafeteria, and gymnasium/stage. The preschool room was equipped with standard early childhood education furniture and supplies (wooden puzzles, picture books, art supplies, blocks, trucks, dolls, housekeeping equipment). All the other rooms were shared with the school so equipment had to be stored and displays taken down after each class session. The use of the media center and computer room were great benefits to the program. Books could be used for research, writing, and story reading. Audio-visual equipment made it possible to use story videos and information filmstrips. The microcomputers and printers were used with software appropriate to the students' literacy levels: Appleworks II-e & II-c (1983), Superprint II (1989), and Children's Writing and Publishing Center (1989). Students used the computers to write family stories and publish books. The middle/secondary class also used them to publish a Project CLASS newspaper one term.

The design of the curriculum required heterogeneous classes with students on varying levels of language and literacy proficiency and from each of the target population groups. Further, the intergenerational classes dictated that activities involve persons from a wide age span--in some cases three generations within one family. Planning for these classes required that the teachers be very flexible and that they plan and teach cooperatively. Over the course of the project, it was determined that teachers with elementary/early childhood education preparation were most likely to have the experience and flexibility to work with multi-age groups and were more open to the integrated curriculum than those with adult ESOL preparation.

Subjects

Subjects were limited English proficient families who lived in Clayton County and had children in the Clayton County Schools (kindergarten through grade 12). Preference was given to low income families.

Recruitment. Four Bilingual Community Liaisons were hired, representing each of the four participating ethnic/language groups: Cambodian/Khmer, Laotian, Vietnamese, and Hispanic. These persons were central to recruiting families to participate in Project CLASS. They were well-known in their particular population's community and neighborhood in Clayton County and were able to make personal contacts, home visits, and telephone calls to inform families about the program and to encourage their enrollment. Brochures were also printed in each of the four target languages and were distributed by the schools, especially the ESOL teachers. A centrally-located elementary school was selected as the site for the program and bus transportation was provided by the school system from the target neighborhoods to the school. Classes were arranged at a time most convenient to the participants (6:30 to 8:30 p.m., two evenings per week). The local refugee self-help organization, the Georgia Mutual Assistance Association Consortium, assisted in identifying the target neighborhoods, selecting the Bilingual Community Liaisons, and recruiting families.

Criteria for selecting the families were:

- Families from one of the target language groups living in Clayton County with at least one child in the Clayton County School System (Kindergarten - Grade 12).
- Families who qualify for free or reduced price lunch (low socio-economic status) were given priority.

It took some trial and error to establish what constituted a family in the target communities. The final definition included extended families, not just nuclear families. To attend as a family:

- at least one adult and one school-age child must attend together; and,

- those individuals must be related to one another.

Initially, many parents wanted to send their children alone to the program. One woman brought 11 children from her apartment complex, all of whom called her "aunt" although she was not related by blood to most of them! A few adults also wanted to attend without any of their school-age children. They were referred to the county's adult education refugee program for an appropriate class. Examples of families who attended Project CLASS included: a woman with her school-aged children and the woman's sister with the sister's preschool children; a grandmother, her daughter, and her grandson; a father with his out-of-school daughters and his school-aged nieces; a mother and father with their school-age and preschool children; three school-age boys and their mother.

Retention. Table 1 presents the enrollment data by year and by population group for adults and children. To be enrolled in the program, families had to complete the demographic data enrollment form and to attend at least three class sessions. Across the three years of the project 55 different families were served. Of those 16 (29%) remained in the program for all three years; 13 (24%) were in the program for two years; 26 (47%) for only one year. Laotian and Hispanic enrollment was fairly constant over the program, but Cambodian/Khmer representation decreased over the three years and Vietnamese representation increased. This was, in part, due to the Bilingual Community Liaisons. The Cambodian liaison was the first hired and was very active in initial recruitment. The Vietnamese liaison was not hired until near the end of Year 1. Other factors influencing enrollment changes included: the mass migration of many of the county's Laotian families when a major airline went bankrupt and the catering company that supplied the airline closed and eliminated jobs held by many of them; serious violence in the Cambodian community that frightened many families and kept them and their children at home in the evenings during the second year of the program.

Table 1
Enrollment by Group and Year

	YEAR 1		YEAR 2		YEAR 3		TOTAL	
ADULTS	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Cambodian	30	61	18	37	11	30	34	37
Laotian	15	31	16	33	12	32	30	33
Vietnamese	1	2	9	18	11	30	21	23
Hispanic	3	6	6	12	3	8	7	8
TOTAL	49	100	49	100	37	100	92	100
CHILDREN	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Cambodian	40	48	38	43	23	36	52	36
Laotian	38	45	33	38	28	44	59	40
Vietnamese	4	5	11	13	10	16	27	19
Hispanic	2	2	6	7	3	5	8	5
TOTAL	84	100	88	100	64	100	146	100
FAMILIES	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Cambodian	19	58	16	42	12	43	23	42
Laotian	12	36	14	37	11	39	20	36
Vietnamese	1	3	5	13	3	11	8	15
Hispanic	1	3	3	8	2	7	4	7
TOTAL	33	100	38	100	28	100	55	100

Attendance was not consistent among the families enrolled in the program. In fact, it ranged from a low of 2% to a high of 65% for adults and 71% for children. The average attendance was only 6% of the sessions. The distribution was skewed with 75% of the adults attending 15% or fewer sessions and 75% of the children attending 22% or fewer sessions. In spite of being a family program, the range of adult participation was somewhat lower than that for children. If adults could not attend one evening, they often sent their children with a neighbor's family. Table 2 presents attendance data by population group and by year. The Bilingual Community Liaisons were responsible for contacting each family when they were absent from class. They also contacted each family just before the beginning of each new term and following any school vacation or holiday. They made home visits to most families, and called others on the telephone. These contacts increased attendance and decreased drop-outs, although families still did not attend consistently. There appear to be many reasons for this problem. Many of the adults had jobs that included overtime work, and it was difficult for them to get home in time to prepare supper and bring their families to the program. As noted above, the violence in the Cambodian community lowered attendance significantly for several months in Year 2. Originally the classes met on Tuesday and Thursday evenings. Later, because of the PTA schedule at the school in which the program was located, the classes had to be changed to Monday and Wednesday evenings. This change caused some absenteeism on Wednesday evenings due to a conflict with a local church group. The middle/secondary school class was especially affected as the church sent a bus to pick up children to participate in their youth group activities.

The program offered 368 hours of instruction over the three year period. However, the average amount of instruction received was only 38 hours. Retention is a serious problem in

Table 2
Attendance Data

	YEAR 1 (# of sessions: 48)				YEAR 2 (# of sessions: 68)				YEAR 3 (# of sessions: 55)				TOTAL (# of sessions: 171)			
ADULTS	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**
Cambodian	11	7	3-40	30	11	5	4-36	18	17	8	5-47	11	12	12	3-111	34
Laotian	9	6	3-42	15	8	5	3-38	16	11	6	3-41	12	9	6	3-87	30
Vietnamese	15	7	18-33	3	11	6	44-47	6	14	8	15-46	3	13	7	4-95	7
Hispanic	3	0	3	1	5	2	3-16	9	12	4	3-17	11	9	5	3-17	21
CHILDREN	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**	**N**
Cambodian	12	8	4-39	40	11	6	3-55	38	14	7	3-46	23	12	7	4-121	52
Laotian	7	4	3-24	38	9	5	3-44	33	9	5	3-30	28	9	4	3-75	59
Vietnamese	9	6	3-14	2	7	3	3-11	6	21	7	38-46	3	13	8	3-53	8
Hispanic	5	1	4-6	4	5	2	3-15	11	9	5	3-16	10	6	4	3-16	27

adult and family literacy programs (Nickse, 1990; Quigley, 1992). Unfortunately, Project CLASS was not an exception to this trend.

Demographic Data. Table 3 presents the demographic data describing the families in Project CLASS. Data are presented on adults and on children for the total group and by population group. Thirty-five percent of the adults enrolled in Project CLASS were Cambodian, 33% Laotian, 24% Vietnamese, and only 8% Hispanic. Sixty percent were women. The average age of the participants was 36.4 years, although the age range was from 17 to 82 years. Families had an average of 2.5 children with a range from 1 to 4. The average educational level of the adults was only fifth grade with a range from no school attendance to high school graduation in their native country. Only 66% of the adults reported being literate in their native language. Experience with bilingual activities in Project CLASS showed that many of the adults indicated they were literate in their native language if they could write their name, recognize the alphabet, and read a few words. Thus, the program was reaching primarily refugee and immigrant families whose education in their native country was quite limited. The fact that many were not literate in their native language was a factor in the difficulty many are experiencing in obtaining literacy in English, their second language.

Among the children there were slightly more girls enrolled in the program than boys. About three-fourths of the children were enrolled in ESOL classes at their schools; the rest had been enrolled and had reached a level of proficiency on the LAB to exit the program. Nearly all the children (89%) were receiving free or reduced price lunch reflecting their family's low income status. Children ranged in age from 2 to 19 years and from preschool to Grade 10. One quarter of the children were in preschool and kindergarten and approximately one half in elementary school (grades 1 - 5). The rest were in middle and secondary school.

Table 3
Demographic Date (all 3 years): Adults

ADULTS	TOTAL			CAMBODIAN			LAOTIAN			VIETNAMESE			HISPANIC		
	#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%	
Gender (N=92)															
Women	55	60		22	40		16	29		12	22		5	9	
Men	36	39		10	28		14	39		10	28		2	6	
Literate in Native Language (N=92)															
Yes	61	66		18	30		17	28		19	31		7	12	
No	21	23		9	43		10	48		2	10		0	0	
Not reported	10	11		6	60		3	30		1	10		0	0	
	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Age in years (N=85)	17-82	36.6	12.00	20-82	37.0	12.3	17-69	36.5	11.5	18-51	33.3	11.3	34-65	46.5	10.0
Years of education (N=85)	0-12	5.4	4.20	0-12	3.6	3.2	0-12	3.9	3.6	0-12	9.2	4.0	6-9	7.7	1.2
# of Children (N=52)	1-4	2.5	.87	1-4	2.3	.8	1-4	2.6	.9	1-4	3.0	.9	1-3	2.0	.7

Table 3
Demographic Data (all 3 years): Children
(continued)

CHILDREN	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gender (N=145)										
Girls	82	56	33	40	32	39	14	17	3	4
Boys	63	43	19	30	27	43	12	19	5	8
School Grade (median) (N=144)										
Pre-K & K	35	24	16	46	13	37	4	11	2	6
1	16	11	8	50	5	31	3	19	0	0
2	21	15	9	43	10	48	2	10	0	0
3	11	8	6	55	2	18	3	27	1	9
4	12	8	4	33	6	50	2	17	0	0
5	19	13	5	26	9	47	5	26	0	0
6	7	5	3	43	2	29	0	0	2	28
7	10	7	1	10	7	70	2	20	0	0
8	3	2	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33
9	6	4	0	0	2	33	4	68	0	0
10	4	3	0	0	1	25	1	25	2	50
ESOL (N=117)										
Yes	85	73	21	25	39	46	20	24	5	6
No	32	27	19	60	10	31	2	6	1	3
Free/Reduced Lunch (N=113)										
Yes	101	89	33	33	44	44	18	18	6	6
No	12	11	6	50	5	42	0	0	1	8

	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Age in years (N=136)	2-19	9.0	3.8	2-13	7.7	2.8	2-19	9.4	4.0	3-18	10.6	4.1	4-15	10.8	4.2

Assessment Instruments

Ongoing assessment was done weekly by the Project CLASS teachers. They used informal observations of their students, samples of students' oral and written English, feedback from the students and liaisons, and teacher-developed exercises to assess their students' progress in acquiring English language and literacy, and in developing knowledge and skills about their new culture and about assisting their children to attain educational success. This assessment information was used to evaluate lessons and themes and to plan subsequent instruction. Part of each weekly planning session was to discuss their evaluations and to use those data in planning. Teachers wrote descriptions of their lessons for each class session including an assessment of each lesson's success in meeting the specific language, literacy, and cultural objectives.

Summative evaluation of the project was also implemented. Published tests, assessment instruments developed for the project, and interviews with participants were used. Specific instruments included:

> Basic English Skills Test (BEST) (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1989). The Oral Interview section was used to assess the adult participants' oral language proficiency. If they scored Level IV ("basic survival needs"; "some simple oral communication") or above they were also given the Literacy Skills section to assess their English reading and writing proficiency. The test was given when they entered the program and at the end of each year of Project CLASS. The BEST test was developed to assess persons with very low levels of English language proficiency (e.g., refugees) for program placement and progress. It has face validity in that the items are "real-life" language tasks and is widely used in basic ESL programs. Internal consistency reliability coefficients range from $r = .72$ to .97.
>
> Cloze Reading Test. This measure was developed for Project CLASS using 100-word paragraphs written on topics related to the program (pre-test: a family with young children; post-test: taking a sick child to the doctor). Each passage had 20 words omitted (about every 5th word). Students selected the word that best completed the sentence from a list of four options. They were instructed to re-read the sentence with the selected word inserted to determine if the sentence made sense within the passage. Readability level of the two paragraphs was

grade 3.8 on the Gunning Fog Index (New Readers Press, 1990, pp. 157-159). The passages used are given in Appendix A.

Writing Task. Participants were asked to write a paragraph about a topic related to Project CLASS' curriculum (pre-test: an excuse to their child's teacher regarding the child's absence from school; post-test: what they would do if their house caught on fire). Writing samples were scored by two independent raters who negotiated any major differences in scoring. The negotiated score was used as the subject's score. Scoring was for communication (Process Writing Scoring Guide, Zurn, 1987) and mechanics--spelling (Temple, Nathan, Burris, & Temple, 1988) and punctuation and capitalization. The writing tasks and scoring guides are given in Appendix A.

Language Assessment Battery (LAB). Students in the Clayton County Schools' ESOL program are administered the LAB test once per year. Scores were obtained from their records. The LAB assesses students' oral and written English proficiency. It is the language measure used in the State of Georgia to determine eligibility for the ESOL program.

Interviews. Personal interviews, using a structured interview form, were held with the Project CLASS personnel including the teachers, liaisons, and administrators. A random sample, stratified by population group, of adults and children (excluding preschool children) was also interviewed. The structured interview forms are given in Appendix A.

Results

Table 4 presents the results of the BEST, Cloze, and writing tests for the adults. While pre-test/post-test scores on some measures increased for some students, t tests do not indicate significant gains on any of the measures for students in any of the years of the project. Scores on the Best Oral Test and on the Cloze reading and process writing measures increased in Years 2 and 3, but the gains were not significant. However, for those students who remained in the program for three years (see Table 5) there was significant increase on the Best Oral Test.

Several concerns are obvious from studying the data. First, very few subjects actually completed a year (or more) and finished both the pre-test and the post-test. Families had a tendency to "disappear" from this program, a trend apparent in other adult literacy programs (Balmuth, 1988; Nickse, 1990; Quigley, 1992). Because they did not announce their intent to drop out, they could not be post-tested. Of those who did remain until the end of the program, some

Table 4
Pre/Post Test Scores and t-Tests: Adults

	Max	YEAR 1						YEAR 2						YEAR 3					
		Pre			Post*			Pre			Post			Pre			Post		
		Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Best Oral	7	2.7	2.1	9	2.9	2.2	0	3.3	1.3	6	4.7	1.5	6	2.0	1.3	6	3.1	1.3	6
Best Lit	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.8	.8	5	3.8	1.2	5
CLOZE	20	12.3	7.4	6	11.0	7.3	6	11.6	6.3	9	12.1	6.3	9	12.4	4.5	12	12.7	5	12
Writing Process	6	3.5	1.1	4	3.3	.8	4	2.6	1.3	7	3.1	1.1	7	3.0	1.4	11	3.5	.7	11
Spelling	4	3.5	.9	4	3.5	.5	4	3.6	.7	7	4.0	0.0	7	3.2	1.1	11	2.9	1.1	11
Mechanics	1	.5	.5	4	.3	.4	4	.2	.4	7	.1	.2	7	.4	.4	11	.3	.3	11

** Pre-test for Year 2 used as Post-test for Year 1.*

	YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2				YEAR 2				YEAR 3			
	Gain	t	Sig.	N	Gain	t	Sig.	N	Gain	t	Sig.	N
Best Oral	.22	.20	n.s.	9	1.34	1.70	n.s.	6	1.17	1.54	n.s.	6
Best Lit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	n.s.	5
CLOZE	-1.33	-.31	n.s.	6	.55	.19	n.s.	9	.25	.13	n.s.	12
Writing Process	-.25	-.36	n.s.	4	.57	.88	n.s.	7	.45	1.0	n.s.	11
Spelling	0	-.50	n.s.	4	.43	1.54	n.s.	7	-.99	-.57	n.s.	11
Mechanics	-.25	-.76	n.s.	4	-.07	-.44	n.s.	7	-.14	-1.0	n.s.	11

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Pre/Post Test Scores and t-Tests: Adults Who Attended Project CLASS for Three Years

	Maximum	YEAR 1 to YEAR 3					
		Pre			Post		
		Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Best Oral	7	2.00	1.63	3	4.67	0.47	3
Best Lit	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLOZE	20	9.50	9.50	2	11.00	6.00	2
Writing Process	6	2.67	1.25	3	3.67	0.47	3
Spelling	4	4.00	0.00	3	2.67	0.94	3
Mechanics	1	0.33	0.47	3	0.50	0.41	3

	YEAR 1 TO YEAR 3			
	Gain	t	Sig.	N
Best Oral	2.67*	2.72	0.05	3
Best Lit	-1.00	0.00	ns	1
CLOZE	1.50	0.19	ns	2
Writing Process	1.00	1.30	ns	3
Spelling	-1.30	-1.63	ns	3
Mechanics	0.17	0.47	ns	3

* $p = .05$

had had such sporadic attendance that it was unreasonable to expect any gains on the assessment measures. Unfortunately, some adults were not post-tested due to reluctance on the part of the staff to interrupt the instructional program and end-of-the-term activities. The fact that adults who remained in the program all three years made a significant gain in oral language proficiency supports the assumption that more regular attendance would have produced greater language gains.

Children in Project CLASS demonstrated significant gains on the LAB test during Year 2, but not Year 3 (see Table 6). In part, this may be an artifact of the way this test is administered by the school system. When a child scores above the 25th percentile, the student exits the ESOL program and is no longer tested. Thus, students who made gains in English proficiency might have exited the ESOL program and not been tested the following year, even though they were still in Project CLASS. Those students' gains could no longer be measured by the LAB. Of course, the students' instruction in their school ESOL classes and in their regular school classes also affected their LAB scores. However, it is important to note that participation in the family English literacy program was related to improved performance on the standardized measure of English language proficiency for the children in this program.

Interview data indicate satisfaction with the program and a general feeling that the participants gained in English language and literacy proficiency. Both the responses to the structured interview questions and unsolicited comments suggest that most of the families and the staff felt that the program was beneficial. Most indicated that the program should continue and that they would like to continue to participate in it. Table 7 summarizes each groups' ratings of various program elements on a five-point scale (5 = "very good", 1 = "poor"). Teachers were the least certain about the effectiveness of the program in developing the adults' English proficiency. The adults themselves were more positive about its effect on both their own and

Table 6
Pre/Post Test Scores and t-Tests: Children

	YEAR 2						YEAR 3					
	Spring/Fall 1990 Pre-tests			Spring 1991 Post-tests			Spring/Fall 1991 Pre-tests			Spring 1992 Post-tests		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
LAB	15.82	11.21	11	42.27	19.87	11	18.05	20.13	22	22.41	22.40	22

	YEAR 2				YEAR 3			
	Gain	t	Sig.	N	Gain	t	Sig.	N
LAB	26.45	3.84	.002	11	4.36	.68	n.s.	22

* *No LAB socres were available for Spring/FAll 1989 so no Year 1 comparisons are possible.*

Table 7
Interview Data

	LIAISONS (N=4)	TEACHERS (N=5)	ADULTS (N=6)	CHILDREN (N=5)	ADMINISTRATORS (N=4)
Did participants English improve?					
Adults: Yes	4	2	6	-	2
No	0	2	0	-	0
DK	0	0	0	-	2
Children: Yes	3	3	4	4	2
No	1	1	2	1	0
DK	0	0	0	0	2
Did you learn about Clayton County?					
Yes	4	5	3	2	3
No	0	0	3	3	0
DK	0	0	0	0	1
Did it help with school work?					
Yes	4	4	3	4	3
No	0	1	3	1	0
DK	0	0	0	0	1
Should CLASS continue?					
Yes	4	4	5	5	4
No	0	1	1	0	0
Would you recommend CLASS to a friend?					
Yes	4	5	4	4	4
No	0	0	2	1	0

DK = *Don't Know*

Table 7
Interview Data: Ratings (Continued)

5 = high 1 = low	LIAISONS					TEACHERS					ADMINISTRATORS				
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Adult classes	2	2	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
School-age classes	1	3	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
Intergenerational activities	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	0
Family activities	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Field trips	0	2	2	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Visitors/speakers	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	0
Parties/holidays	3	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Computers	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	1
Bus	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Location	3	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
Day/time	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1
Liaisons	-	-	-	-	-	4	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Teachers	2	2	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	4	0	0	0	0

Table 7
Interview Data: Ratings (Continued)

5 = high 1 = low	ADULTS					CHILDREN				
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Adult classes	3	1	2	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
School-age classes	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	0	0	0
Intergenerational activities	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0
Family activities	5	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1
Field trips	5	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	0
Visitors/speakers	4	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	0
Parties/holidays	5	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Computers	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	1
Bus	5	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1
Location	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0
Day/time	5	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0
Liaisons	5	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1
Teachers	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0

their children's English. Most everyone wanted Project CLASS to continue and would recommend it to other LEP families. These ratings indicate that both the teachers and the liaisons were rated as "very good". In general, the classes for adults and children and the intergenerational and family activities were rated as "very good" also. Field trips and visitors/speakers had a slightly lower rating, but parties/holiday celebrations were rated "very good". The logistics (bus, location, days/time) were rated high except for dissatisfaction with holding classes on Wednesdays. This was, no doubt, due to the conflict with the church activities and the resulting lowered attendance. In retrospect, the program probably should have been scheduled for Mondays and Thursdays, rather than Mondays and Wednesdays.

Two surprising ratings were the field trips and the computers. During the program the liaisons complained that the field trips were "a waste of time" and said that the families in their populations were complaining about them. In fact, the adults and children rated the field trips as "very good", although the liaisons rated them lower. The other surprising rating was the low rating given to the computer program across the board. It appeared to be one of the more successful activities both in terms of language and literacy instruction and intergenerational cooperation. However, it is clear that not everyone agreed. It would have been interesting to probe further to learn why there was so much dissatisfaction with that theoretically-sound activity.

The results of the assessment instruments indicate that participants and staff felt that Project CLASS was successful as a family English literacy program. The test results, however, indicate only very limited significant gains in language and literacy. This may be due, in part, to the sporadic attendance of those participants who were tested and the failure to obtain post-test scores on all of the adults.

Discussion

The data provide a mixed evaluation on the success of Project CLASS. The families benefited from attending this program together and clearly felt that they had gained in both language and literacy proficiency and in cultural and community knowledge and skills. Each of the objectives of the program was fulfilled: an integrated English language and literacy program was provided for LEP families along with the knowledge and skills needed to adjust to their new culture and to fully support the educational success of their children (Objectives 1, 2, 3). Further the curriculum (Objective 4) and the community resource guide (Objective 5) were developed, field-tested, and published (Nurss & Rawlston, 1992; Nurss, Rawlston, Cargile, & Jones, 1992). A number of professional presentations were made and articles about the program published (Nurss & Rawlston, 1991; Rawlston, 1992; Nurss & Rawlston, in press). These are listed in Appendix B.

However, the low attendance rate and the high drop-out rate prevented the program from having the desired impact on the families enrolled. This is a serious problem for all adult and family literacy programs and needs to be solved if these programs are going to seriously impact the high rate of adult literacy in the United States. The bilingual community liaisons attempted to contact each family who dropped out of the program to determine the reasons for dropping out. Of those contacted, 39% had moved from the community, 30% had had a shift change at work or were required to work overtime on a regular basis, 22% had begun an evening job, 4% changed to an adult ESL class, and 4% needed child care (for newborns). These reasons--primarily moving or changes in work schedule--are typical of the reasons given by adults for dropping out of adult literacy classes (Nurss & Chase, 1989; Nickse, 1990).

Strengths of the Program. Project CLASS had several elements that contributed to its success as a family English literacy program. These included:

- Integrated program -- The content-based curriculum that integrated language, literacy, and culture into each activity provided instruction relevant to the participants and knowledge that could be applied immediately in their families during the intergenerational, family activities and at home in their daily lives.

- Liaisons -- Project CLASS could not have functioned without the Bilingual Community Liaisons. They were essential to recruitment and retention of the families and to initial functioning in the program. Liaisons' role with written language translations into their native language was especially necessary due to the low level of native language literacy of most of the adults.

- Teachers and Instructional Coordinator -- The interview data confirm the strength of the teaching staff throughout the program. Their interest in developing a flexible, cooperative instructional program and their willingness to try a new approach to teaching was crucial to Project CLASS's success.

- Planning -- The entire staff, especially the teachers and the Instructional Site Coordinator, felt they could have used even more group planning time to develop, plan, and assess the family English literacy curriculum. Certainly, the paid planning time, both weekly and quarterly, was essential to the program.

- Cultural Activities -- The opportunity for all participants to learn about their new U.S. culture and one another's cultures, and for children to learn about their native culture was integral to the language and literacy curriculum in Project CLASS. The field trips, visitors and speakers, parties, holiday celebrations, and story telling were activities that accomplished both objectives and were fun for the participants as well.

- Preschool Class -- Child care is, of course, necessary for a successful family literacy program. The provision of a trained teacher for this class, however, meant that the preschool children in Project CLASS learned oral English and gained many cognitive and social skills that prepared them to enter Kindergarten. This class was just as important to the school support function of Project CLASS as were the elementary and middle/secondary classes. Although the preschool children were not tested on any measures of their language growth, it appeared that many of them made great strides in acquiring oral proficiency. Most of the preschoolers entered the program speaking no English at all, and many exited communicating quite well.

Problems Encountered. There were several problems encountered that should be avoided in future family English literacy programs, if possible. These included:

- Sporadic attendance -- Efforts were made to keep attendance in Project CLASS high. However, that did not happen. The sporadic attendance caused morale problems among the staff and definitely lowered language and literacy acquisition of the participants. While it is understandable that various "life events" (e.g., illness, work, family problems) caused less than perfect attendance among the participants, to be successful literacy programs must find a way to have at least 90% attendance. Incentives need to be considered along with other family supports that would keep families in regular attendance.

- High drop-out rate -- Similarly, the high drop-out rate negatively affected both morale and achievement. An incentive program might also help the families to continue attending. More frequent assessment and tangible evidence of progress might also help. Both low attendance and high drop-out rate are common adult literacy problems in need of solution (Nickse, 1990; Quigley, 1992).

- Assessment -- The staff and, to some extent, the participants showed some concern about assessment, both formative and summative. Unfortunately, this concern worked against the success of the program as some participants were not tested and their progress could not be marked. Standardized testing is only one way programs are assessed, but it does give a benchmark allowing comparison with other programs in the research literature. Further, the funding agency requested objective assessment measures. Work on innovative ways to assess adult ESL literacy (Sticht, 1990; French, 1992) is underway and, perhaps, future programs will have a wider variety of options from which to select.

- Difficulty of adult literacy teachers to adjust to model -- The instructional model in Project CLASS required that the teachers plan integrated, content-based units to present language and literacy instruction. Further, it required that the teachers develop concrete, hands-on activities for multi-level, multi-age classes. This type of planning was more difficult for the adult ESL teachers than for teachers with elementary/early childhood education training and experience. Teachers hired for an intergenerational program must be able to work with the full spectrum of ages as well as to plan and teach cooperatively with one another.

Conclusions

Project CLASS offered the participants an opportunity to learn language and literacy together as a family and to have fun while doing so. It offered participants and staff an opportunity to learn about other cultures and to respect persons with different cultural/language backgrounds. It helped parents to understand more of what is expected of them as parents of

school-age children in the United States and how to use the resources of the community and school to do so.

Recommendations for Family English Literacy Programs. As with most adult literacy programs, it is recommended that future family English literacy programs give even more attention to ways to motivate families to attend consistently and to remain in the program long enough to demonstrate gains in language and literacy. Techniques such as transportation, child care, and bilingual liaisons were very helpful in this program. However, other techniques need to be tried. For example, incentives for attendance, more frequent assessment and feedback to participants, and more involvement of the participants in planning and evaluating the activities. The integrated, thematic approach and the multi-level, intergenerational activities and field trips and holiday celebrations is strongly recommended to other programs.

References

Abbott, M. (1992). Language Assessment Battery. New York, NY: New York City Board of Education.

Apple Computer. (1983). Appleworks for II-e & II-c. Cupertino, CA: Apple Computer, Inc.

Auerbach, E. R. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 59(2), 165-181.

Balmuth, M. (1988). Recruitment and retention in adult basic education: What does the research say? Journal of Reading, 31(7), 620-623.

Center for Applied Linguistics (1989). Basic English Skills Test. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Creative Pursuits. (1989). The children's writing and publishing center. Fremont, CA: The Learning Company.

Enright, D. S., & McCloskey, M. L. (1988). Integrating English: Developing English language and literacy in the multilingual classroom. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

French, R. L. (1992). Portfolio assessment and LEP students. In Focus on evaluation and measurement. Proceedings of the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues (pp. 249-272). Washington, DC: Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, U.S. Department of Education.

McIvor, M. C. (Ed.). (1990). Family literacy in action: A survey of successful programs. Syracuse, NY: New Readers Press.

Nash, A. (Ed.). (1987). English family literacy: An annotated bibliography. Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts English Family Literacy Project.

New Readers Press (1990). Reader development bibliography. Syracuse, NY: New Readers Press.

Nickse, R. S. (1990). Family and intergenerational literacy programs: An update of "The Noises of Literacy". Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Nurss, J. R., & Chase, N. D. (1989). Workplace literacy: A tool for recruitment. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 13(1), 16-23.

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (1991). Family stories: Intergenerational literacy. TESOL Journal, 1(1), 29, 32.

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (1992). Clayton family literacy and school support services project: Project CLASS. Family English literacy curriculum. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

Nurss, J. R., Rawlston, S., Cargile, J., & Jones, S. (1992). Project CLASS Community Resource Directory Clayton County Georgia. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University.

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (in press). Family literacy: Intergenerational ESL literacy activities at home. TESOL in Action, in press for Fall 1992.

Pelican Software. (1989). Superprint II. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Quigley, B. A. (1992). Attrition in literacy and adult basic education. Mosaic: Research notes on literacy, 2(2), 4, 6.

Quintero, E., & Huerta-Macias, A. (1988). Project FIEL: Family initiative for English literacy handbook. El Paso, TX: El Paso Community College.

Rawlston, S. (1992). Project CLASS. TESOL Matters, 2(4), 8.

Simich-Dudgeon, C. (Ed.). (1986). Issues of parent involvement and literacy. San Antonio, TX: Trinity College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 275 206)

Sticht, T. G. (1990). Testing and assessment in adult basic education and English as a Second Language Programs. San Diego, CA: Applied Behavioral & Cognitive Sciences, Inc.

Temple, C., Nathan, R., Burris, N., & Temple, F. (1988). The beginnings of writing. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Terdy, D., & Bercovitz, L. (1989). Home English literacy for parents: An ESL family literacy curriculum. DesPlaines, IL: Northwest Educational Corporation.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1988). Project LEIF (Learning English through intergenerational friendship). Program development manual for building community across generations and across cultures. Philadelphia, PA: Center for International Learning, Institute on Aging, Temple University.

Zurn, M. R. (1987). A comparison of kindergartners handwritten and word processor-generated writing. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta. Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 427-A. (University Microfilm No. 88-08112)

Appendix A

Assessment Instruments

READING PRE-TEST

ID#_____

Read the paragraph with the blanks in it. Then re-read the paragraph and decide which word goes in the blank. Draw a circle around that word. Re-read the sentence to be certain it makes sense.

There are five people _____ this family.

a. on
b. in
c. of
d. at

There are _____ and Father.

a. Father
b. Grandmother
c. Mother
d. Family

They _____ two sons and one _____.

a. have	a. son
b. has	b. daughter
c. are	c. father
d. is	d. mother

Two children are in _____.

a. grade
b. third
c. elementary
d. school

One child is at _____.

a. home
b. shop
c. work
d. car

He is two years _____.

a. old
b. age
c. year
d. young

Mother takes care of _____.

a. her
b. his
c. him
d. he

The older son is in elementary _____ ___.

a. high
b. school
c. kindergarten
d. junior

He is in _____.

a. school
b. home
c. family
d. grade

He is eight _____ old.

a. years
b. days
c. week
d. months

The daughter is in kindergarten. _____ is five years old.

a. He
b. They
c. She
d. We

She _____ to school with her _____.

a. works
b. goes
c. eats
d. was

a. sister
b. grandmother
c. brother
d. mother

They go _____ Jones Elementary School.

a. at
b. in
c. of
d. to

_____ is in Clayton County Georgia.

a. They
b. It
c. He
d. She

_____ cooks dinner for the _____.

a. Brother
b. Sister
c. Grandmother
d. Family

a. school
b. work
c. shop
d. family

Father buys _____.

a. grade
b. year
c. home
d. food

He goes to _____ in the car.

a. work
b. school
c. kindergarten
d. family

READING POST-TEST

ID#_____

Read the story with the blanks in it. Then re-read each sentence and decide which word goes in the blank. Draw a circle around that word. Re-read the sentence with that word in it to be certain that the word makes sense.

Maria does not feel _____ . She is sick.

a. sick
b. good
c. sing
d. gone

_____ mother has taken her to _____ doctor's office.

a. Him
b. His
c. She
d. Her

a. then
b. they
c. the
d. them

The doctor _____ her what is wrong.

a. asks
b. says
c. talks
d. laughs

Maria _____, "I have a _____ throat.

a. asks
b. says
c. talks
d. laughs

a. sprained
b. broken
c. sore
d. rash

It hurts when _____ swallow. My head hurts.

a. my
b. me
c. I
d. you

I _____ breathe through my _____."

a. won't
b. can't
c. isn't
d. aren't

a. nose
b. eyes
c. ears
d. arms

The doctor says, "Open _____ mouth wide and say 'ahh'."

a. his
b. you
c. her
d. your

_____ says, "Ahh."
a. Doctor
b. Mother
c. Father
d. Maria

The _____ tells Maria's mother that _____ has a temperature.

a. doctor	a. he
b. mother	b. she
c. father	c. they
d. Maria	d. you

She _____ stay in bed.
a. have
b. has
c. must
d. are

She must _____ a lot of water and _____.

a. carry	a. apple
b. eat	b. juice
c. wash	c. orange
d. drink	d. egg

She must take two aspirin _____ four hours.
a. every
b. any
c. many
d. ever

He gives Maria's _____ a prescription for medicine.
a. doll
b. doctor
c. mother
d. father

She will _____ it to the drugstore to _____ filled.

a. take	a. are
b. turn	b. is
c. mail	c. was
d. type	d. be

WRITING PRE-TEST

ID#_____

Write a note to your child's teacher explaining why your child was absent from school for 3 days last week.

WRITING POST-TEST

ID#_____

Write about what you would do if your house caught on fire.

Process Writing Scoring Guide

6	Ideas are very well developed and expressed. The writing has fully developed structure. The ideas are connected logically and are well-organized. There is good sentence variety and expression.
5	Ideas are fairly well developed and expressed. The writing has a discernible structure. The ideas are connected logically, but they are not so fully developed or so well-organized as score 6 papers.
4	Ideas are only loosely connected or not developed. The structure may be disjointed, but what is provided is clearly more than a list. The ideas are relevant but are not developed or expressed well. The sentence structure may be repetitive.
3	Ideas lack development. The writing often merely lists ideas. The phrasing and sentence structure are repetitious.
2	Ideas have little or no relationship to the topic. An idea or a list is provided that is not connected logically to the topic.
1	Lack of ideas. All that is presented is a restatement of the question or topic to be addressed.
UN	Undecipherable
BL	Blank

Adapted from Zurn, M. R. (1987). A comparison of kindergartners handwritten and word processor-generated writing. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta. Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 427-A. (University Microfilm No. 88-08112)

Writing Mechanics Scoring Guide

Spelling

0 Prephonemic

Strings of letters; no representation of phonemes.
Examples: tortog og ork
Eor RotkortKD for Lauren

1 Early phonemic

Letters represent one or two sounds in word; sparse representation of phonemes.
Examples: MBEWWMLnt for My baby was with me last night.
VLtn DAL isoMthR for Valentine's Day is almost here.

2 Letter name

Phonemes are represented with letters; phonemes are represented on basis of similarity between sound of letter names and phonemes.
Example: It trd in to a brd. for It turned into a bird.
drif for drive; lat for late; suf for shove.

3 Transitional

Using conventions of standard spelling, but uses them uncertainly & inconsistently; irregular spellings may be regularized.

Examples: Can we go see the form (Can we go see the farm?)
well we mite go later (Well, we might go later.)
ohcaye (O.K.)
I will get redey no. (I will get ready now.)

4 Correct

Most words are spelled correctly.

Punctuation and Capitalization

0 Punctuation and capital letters omitted or used randomly.

1 Punctuation and capital letters included correctly.

Adapted from Temple, C., Nathan, R., Burris, N., & Temple, F. (1988). The beginnings of writing. Second edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

INTERVIEW FOR ADULTS ID #:_____

1. What did you like best about Project CLASS?

2. What did you like least about Project CLASS?

3. Has your English gotten better since you've been coming to Project CLASS? . **YES NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

4. Did you like having someone who speaks, reads, and writes both your language and English with you at Project CLASS? ..... **YES NO**

   If YES, why? If NO, why not?

5. Name some of the things you have learned about Clayton County in Project CLASS.

6. Has Project CLASS helped you talk with your children's teachers?

Is it easier to read notices sent home from school? ..... **YES NO**
Is it easier to write a note to the teacher? ..... **YES NO**
Can you help your child with homework better now? ..... **YES NO**

If YES, how? If NO, why not?

7. Has your children's English gotten better since coming to Project CLASS? ... **YES NO**

If YES, how? If NO, why not?

8. Has your children's schoolwork gotten better since coming to Project CLASS? **YES NO**

If YES, how? If NO, why not?

9. What did you like best about working with your children?

10. What did you not like about working with your children?

11. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (very good) and 1 being the lowest (poor, not good), tell me what you thought about:

Adult class	1 2 3 4 5
Activities during which children and adults were learning together	1 2 3 4 5
Family activities	1 2 3 4 5
Field trips	1 2 3 4 5
Visitors/ Speakers	1 2 3 4 5
Parties/ Holiday celebrations	1 2 3 4 5
Computer activities	1 2 3 4 5
Bus transportation	1 2 3 4 5
Location	1 2 3 4 5
Days and Time	1 2 3 4 5
Bilingual Community Liaisons	1 2 3 4 5
Teachers	1 2 3 4 5

12. Would you like to continue coming to Project CLASS? . . . . . **YES** **NO**

If YES, why? If NO, why not?

13. Would you tell your friends to come to Project CLASS? . . . . **YES** **NO**

14. What would you change about Project CLASS to make it better for you and your family?

INTERVIEW FOR CHILDREN ID #:_____

1. What did you like best about Project CLASS?

2. What did you like least about Project CLASS?

3. Has your English gotten better since you've been coming to Project CLASS? . **YES NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

4. Did you like having classmates from other countries? ..... **YES NO**

   What did you like best? Why?

   What did you like least? Why?

5. Name some of the things you have learned about Clayton County in Project CLASS.

6. Has Project CLASS helped you with your schoolwork?

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

7. Did you like working with your parents or family? ..... **YES NO**

   What did you like best? Why?

   What did you like least? Why?

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (very good) and 1 being the lowest (poor, not good), tell me what you thought about:

School-Age Class (your class)	1 2 3 4 5
Activities during which children and adults were learning together	1 2 3 4 5
Family activities	1 2 3 4 5
Field trips	1 2 3 4 5
Visitors/ Speakers	1 2 3 4 5
Parties/ Holiday celebrations	1 2 3 4 5
Computer activities	1 2 3 4 5
Bus transportation	1 2 3 4 5
Location	1 2 3 4 5
Days and Time	1 2 3 4 5
Bilingual Community Liaisons	1 2 3 4 5
Teachers	1 2 3 4 5

9. Would you like to continue coming to Project CLASS? ..... **YES** **NO**

   If YES, why? If NO, why not?

10. Would you tell your friends to come to Project CLASS? ..... **YES** **NO**

    If YES, why? If NO, why not?

11. What would you change about Project CLASS to make it better for you and your family?

INTERVIEW FOR TEACHERS ID #:_____

1. What did you like best about Project CLASS?

2. What did you like least about Project CLASS?

3. Did your students' English improve while attending Project CLASS? ..... **YES** **NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

4. Were the bilingual community liaisons helpful to you? ..... **YES** **NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

5. Do you think the families learned about Clayton County in Project CLASS? . **YES NO**

   If YES, what? If NO, why not?

6. Do you think Project CLASS has helped with the children's schoolwork? .... **YES NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

7. What family dynamics do you think affected intergenerational activities?

8. Were parenting strategies included in the adult activities? ..... **YES NO**

   If YES, what strategies? If NO, why not?

9. What changes would you make in the intergenerational activities?

10. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (very good) and 1 being the lowest (poor, not good), tell me what you thought about:

Adult classes	1 2 3 4 5
School-age classes	1 2 3 4 5
Intergenerational activities	1 2 3 4 5
Family activities	1 2 3 4 5
Field trips	1 2 3 4 5
Visitors/ Speakers	1 2 3 4 5
Parties/ Holiday celebrations	1 2 3 4 5
Computer activities	1 2 3 4 5
Bus transportation	1 2 3 4 5
Location	1 2 3 4 5
Days and Time	1 2 3 4 5
Bilingual Community Liaisons	1 2 3 4 5

11. Would you like to continue working with Project CLASS? ..... **YES NO**

If YES, why? If NO, why not?

12. Would you recommend Project CLASS to LEP families in Clayton County? . . **YES NO**

13. What would you change or add to Project CLASS to improve its usefulness to the families?

INTERVIEW FOR BILINGUAL COMMUNITY LIAISONS

ID #:_____

1. What did you like best about Project CLASS?

2. What did you like least about Project CLASS?

3. Did the English of "your" families improve while attending Project CLASS?

   Adults ..... **YES** **NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

   School-age children ..... **YES** **NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

4. Do you think the families learned about Clayton County in Project CLASS? . **YES NO**

   If YES, what? If NO, why not?

5. Do you think Project CLASS has helped with the children's schoolwork? . . . . **YES NO**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

6. Why was it important to have bilingual individuals working with Project CLASS?

7. What was the most important function of the bilingual community liaison during class session?

8. What was the most important function of the bilingual community liaison outside of class session?

9. How important is it for the bilingual community liaison to be included in planning curriculum? ..... **VERY IMPORTANT**
..... **NOT IMPORTANT**

Why? Why not?

10. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (very good) and 1 being the lowest (poor, not good), tell me what you thought about:

Adult classes	1 2 3 4 5
School-age classes	1 2 3 4 5
Intergenerational activities	1 2 3 4 5
Family activities	1 2 3 4 5
Field trips	1 2 3 4 5
Visitors/ Speakers	1 2 3 4 5
Parties/ Holiday celebrations	1 2 3 4 5
Computer activities	1 2 3 4 5
Bus transportation	1 2 3 4 5
Location	1 2 3 4 5
Days and Time	1 2 3 4 5
Teachers	1 2 3 4 5

11. Would you like to continue working with Project CLASS? ..... **YES NO**

If YES, why? If NO, why not?

12. Would you recommend Project CLASS? to LEP families in Clayton County? . **YES NO**

13. What would you change or add to Project CLASS to improve its usefulness to the families?

INTERVIEW FOR ADMINISTRATOR ID #:_____

1. What did you like best about Project CLASS?

2. What did you like least about Project CLASS?

3. Did the adults' English improve while attending Project CLASS? ..... **YES NO DON'T KNOW**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

4. Did the children's English improve while attending Project CLASS? ..... **YES NO DON'T KNOW**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

5. Do you think the families learned about Clayton County in Project CLASS? . **YES NO DON'T KNOW**

   If YES, what? If NO, why not?

6. Do you think Project CLASS has helped with the children's schoolwork? .... **YES NO DON'T KNOW**

   If YES, how? If NO, why not?

7. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (very good) and 1 being the lowest (poor, not good), tell me what you thought about:

Adult classes	1 2 3 4 5
School-age classes	1 2 3 4 5
Intergenerational activities	1 2 3 4 5
Family activities	1 2 3 4 5
Field trips	1 2 3 4 5
Visitors/ Speakers	1 2 3 4 5
Parties/ Holiday celebrations	1 2 3 4 5
Computer activities	1 2 3 4 5
Bus transportation	1 2 3 4 5
Location	1 2 3 4 5
Days and Time	1 2 3 4 5
Bilingual Community Liaisons	1 2 3 4 5
Teachers	1 2 3 4 5

8. Would you like Project CLASS to continue? ..... **YES NO**

   If YES, why? If NO, why not?

9. Would you recommend Project CLASS to LEP families in Clayton County? . . **YES NO**

10. What would you change or add to Project CLASS to improve its usefulness to the families?

Appendix B

Dissemination Efforts

Publications:

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (1991). Family stories: Intergenerational literacy. TESOL Journal, 1(1). 29, 32.

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (1992). Clayton family literacy and school support services project: Project CLASS. Final Report. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (1992). Clayton family literacy and school support services project: Project CLASS. Family English literacy curriculum. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

Nurss, J. R., Rawlston, S., Cargile, J., & Jones, S. (1992). Project CLASS Community Resource Directory Clayton County Georgia. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University.

Nurss, J. R., & Rawlston, S. (in press). Family literacy: Intergenerational ESL literacy activities at home. TESOL in Action, in press for Fall 1992.

Rawlston, S. (1992). Project CLASS. TESOL Matters, 2(4), 8.

Conference Presentations:

Nurss, J. R. "Stories Across the Generations: Intergenerational Family Literacy." Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, Family Literacy Symposium, Atlanta, GA, April 1991.

Nurss, J. R. "Parents & Children Writing and Reading Together." National Association for the Education of Young Children, Denver, CO, November 1991.

Rawlston, S. "Involving ESL Parents in Family Literacy." State of Georgia Chapter I Conference, Macon, GA, September 1990.

Rawlston, S. "Nurturing the Imagination: Multicultural Literature in a Family Literacy Project." National Council of Teachers of English Conference, Atlanta, GA, November, 1990.

Rawlston, S., Spradlin, J., & Dutton, K. "Intergenerational Family Literacy." Georgia State University/Georgia TESOL Conference, Atlanta, GA, December 1990.

Rawlston, S., Lehman, M., & Outhavong, G. "Using Family Stories to Promote ESOL Literacy." Georgia TESOL Conference, Atlanta, GA, April 1991.

Rawlston, S., Nurss, J.R., Lehman, M., & Cargile, J. "Collaborating for Family & Intergenerational Literacy." Southeastern Regional TESOL Conference, Atlanta, GA, October 1991.

Rawlston, S. "Using and Producing Learner-Generated Materials: Collaboration for Family and Intergenerational Literacy." TESOL International Conference, Vancouver, BC, Canada, March 1992.

Rawlston, S. "ESOL Literacy in a Family Setting." Multifunctional Resource Center Conference, America 2000, Tulsa, OK, October 1992.

Conferences Sponsored:

"Intergenerational Family Literacy Workshop," presented by Gail Weinstein-Shr, Clayton State College, Morrow, GA, February 29, 1991.

Awards:

Point of Excellence Award. Presented to Clayton Family Literacy and School Support Services Project by Kappa Delta Pi, Atlanta, GA, February 23, 1992.

James Cash Penney Community Service Award. Presented to Clayton Family Literacy and School Support Services Project by J.C. Penney Company, Atlanta, GA, September 4, 1992.